

REMARKS

Initially, applicant wants to thank the Examiner for the interview granted to the undersigned on April 6, 2005. The comments below reiterate the substance of that interview.


Claims 24-72 are pending, with claims 24, 29, 34, 38, 41, 46, 51, 55, 59, 64, 69 being independent. Claims 34-40 and 51-72 have been withdrawn from consideration, leaving claims 24-33 and 41-50 pending, with claims 24, 29, 41 and 46 being independent.

As discussed at the interview, each of claims 24, 29, 41 and 46 has been amended to more clearly recite the relationship between the conductive layer and the pitch of the second lines or the scanning lines. In particular, each of the independent claims has been amended to recite that the conductive layer continuously extends along the side edge of the first substrate for more than a pitch of the second lines (claims 24 and 41) or a pitch of adjacent scanning lines (claims 29 and 46). As also discussed at the interview, support for this amendment may be found in the application at, for example, Fig. 7, which shows that the dummy wiring 401 (which exemplifies the recited conductive layer) continuously extends along a first side edge of the substrate for more than P1 in the region R1, and that the dummy wiring 401 continuously extends along a second side edge of the substrate for more than P2 in the region R2. As noted in the application at page 29, lines 20-22, P1 and P2 equal, respectively, the pitches of the scanning lines 106 and the signal lines 105. Since, in both regions R1 and R2, the dummy wiring 401 continuously extends for more than the pitches P1 and P2, the dummy wiring "continuously extends along said side edge of said first substrate for more than a pitch of said second lines," as recited in claims 24 and 41, and "continuously extends along said side edge of said first substrate for more than a pitch of the adjacent ones of said scanning lines," as recited in claims 29 and 46. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced.

The title has been amended in response to the Examiner's objection.

Claims 24-33 and 41-50 have been rejected under section 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the claims are rejected due to an alleged failure of the specification to support the recitations in each of the

independent claims that the conductive layer “continuously extends ...”. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in view of the amendments to the independent claims and the discussion provided above. As noted above, Fig. 7 clearly illustrates this aspect of the claims. For example, as shown in the marked up portion of Fig. 7 inserted below, the dummy wiring 401 (which exemplifies the recited conductive layer) continuously extends along a side edge (“SE”) of the substrate for a distance (“D1”) that is more than P1 (which, as noted above, equals the pitch of the scanning lines).



For at least these reasons, the rejection under section 112 should be withdrawn.

Claims 24, 27, 29, 32, 41, 44, 46 and 49 have been rejected as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tanaka. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because, as discussed at the interview, neither AAPA, Tanaka, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests a conductive layer that continuously extends along the side edge of the first substrate for more than a pitch of the second lines, as recited in claims 24 and 41, or for more than a pitch of adjacent scanning lines, as recited in claims 29 and 46. Indeed, in view of the rejection under section 112, first paragraph, the rejection does not even assert this to be the case.

Claims 25, 30, 42 and 47 have been rejected as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tanaka and Yang. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Yang does not remedy the failure of AAPA and Tanaka to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Claims 26, 31, 43 and 48 have been rejected as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tanaka and Teramoto. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Teramoto does not remedy the failure of AAPA and Tanaka to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Claims 28, 33, 45 and 50 have been rejected as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tanaka and Shimada. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Shimada does not remedy the failure of AAPA and Tanaka to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$450 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

5/12/05



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331